
America Asleep as New World Era Opens

Author(s): F. E. Chadwick

Source: *The Journal of Race Development*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Apr., 1917), pp. 410-433

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29738212>

Accessed: 01-08-2014 01:26 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



<http://www.jstor.org>

AMERICA ASLEEP AS NEW WORLD ERA OPENS¹

By F. E. Chadwick, Rear-Admiral, U. S. N. Retired

We are in the midst of a situation which is only comparable to that of the fifth century. Every man who thinks at all knows that there was never a more pressing call for seriousness of thought and character; that it is no time for emotionalism or snap judgments.

We have no doubt our varying views as to how the terrible situation in which the world is now has come about. I will only say that its origin is not of today. We must go back to the sixteenth century for its beginnings in the carving up of the world into what are now called "spheres of influence," and to the struggles which have been continuous, or at least sleepless, since then for maritime and commercial supremacy.

There was practically not even a rest until the end of the Napoleonic period, when the Spanish, Dutch and French navies being swept from the seas, British imperialistic control was fully established. I shall not go into the details of this accomplishment which every schoolboy is taught, but which few remember, and the philosophy of which even their instructors rarely take in. But in this philosophy is the secret of this great war.

It has been the ever active greed of individuals, corporations and nations which began and continued our present conditions. I am not finding fault with what, in its beginning, was a perfectly natural and elemental thing. But it should not have fastened itself upon the world so fixedly.

It is unfortunate that the conditions were intensified instead of being alleviated along with the rest of the world's changes for the better; as, for instance, democracy instead

¹ An address delivered before the Lawyers Club of New York.

of feudalism and autocracy; freedom instead of chattel slavery.

In my view, there could at any time have been an adjustment of methods which would have secured peace. Had the principles of the Monroe doctrine had universal application two centuries before it was enunciated for American consumption only, the world would have been saved centuries of strife and Niagaras of blood.

Had such a principle been applied, say in the eighteenth century, our revolution would not have been, nor the Napoleonic wars, for all these were wars over economic questions.

Have we learned anything by all these bloody struggles? Not much. We find here at home talk of renewal of "protection," so-called, but which should really be called "restriction" of trade. And we know of the late meeting in Paris of the representatives of the Entente powers, which meeting was declaredly for an economic war, which could only bring again this war of blood.

In regard to the actual outbreak, I would advise waiting a bit to make up your minds. "Truth is the daughter of Time," and a few years will clear the atmosphere of doubt and fallacy. There is no use in forming a judgment as to events on publications since August 3, 1914. It is impossible to have a sane judgment in these great matters unless one were a student of them before the war.

To such the war was no surprise, for its imminence and certainty were clear years before.

We were ignorant here because of a shallow press for one thing and on account of our general distaste for anything not strictly commercial for another. Newspaper men are necessarily, as a rule, by the exigencies of their profession, but skimmers of affairs, so to speak. Every day they have to get out in a few hours a great heterogeneous mass of so-called information, most of which is of a trivial character and a great part of which had better not appear at all.

Having necessarily to deal chiefly with the immediate present, they have no time for the philosophy of things. There are, of course, exceptions, but thought in the main

is reserved for the weekly or monthly publications, and we find none too much of it there.

When one comes to know the fact, and it is a great fact, that the vast majority of all classes don't think, and don't want to think, one can understand how vital to human uplift a good newspaper press is. The thoughtful man with us must as a rule turn to the admirable foreign reviews, of which there are many, but of which there are too few in our own country.

And this is so because there is too little demand for serious literature. We don't in the main take kindly to serious things; we like a baseball game better. It has thus come about that we know nothing of the foundations of this war.

I say this deliberately. We have had plenty of emotions, but few sound judgments. You cannot form a judgment of such a world-moving event by detached incidents, terrible and heartrending as these may be. Thus the well-known Boston lawyer, John Chipman Gray, who was an officer in our Civil War, describes, in a letter printed in the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* for May last, a meeting with Sherman on his arrival on the coast after his famous march through Georgia.

He mentions Sherman's telling, "with evident delight how, on his march, he could look forty miles in each direction and see the smoke rolling up as from one great bonfire."

Can we base our opinion of the justification for that war upon such things? No more can we base our opinions of this war upon actual or supposed atrocities on either side.

Such things, sad and terrible, stir out feelings, but they should not warp our judgment of the much greater questions of this world moving matter. Most of us are, however, I fear, in the situation of an old friend of mine who said, "I do not like to have my prejudices upset by facts."

Coming back to events: The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were spent in wars to rearrange world ownership. France had occupied a large part of North America and many of the West Indian islands; Holland was also an owner in North America, possessing a great

colony in what is now New York; England occupied later in the seventeenth century all of what is now our Atlantic seaboard, except Florida.

In the middle of that century she had destroyed Holland's sea power, both mercantile and naval; had seized New York, and a little after the middle of the eighteenth century had driven France from Canada and practically held nearly all east of the Mississippi.

The peace of 1763 left but two owners in North America—Great Britain and Spain. Florida was given to Britain as an offset to the relinquishment of Havana, taken in 1762. The peace of 1783 established the United States. Florida was returned to Spain, and there were again three nations in North America—the United States, Great Britain and Spain. There was to be no permanent settlement by Russia in Alaska until 1784.

In 1803 France had again, though but for a year or so, become an owner in North America. Napoleon had forced Spain to retrocede Louisiana, with a promise that it should not be alienated to another power. But, as always, international promises are of small moment in face of national necessities and the great region then known as Louisiana was practically given to us by Napoleon, we paying the nominal sum of \$15,000,000.

The reason for this action was the new outbreak of war between France and England, and the almost certainty of Louisiana's going to England in case France should attempt to hold it.

Our going beyond the Mississippi was thus due to Napoleon; Jefferson had not wished such an extension; he only as President advised acceptance of what was thrown into our lap.

We all know how we developed in the next fifty years into a great and almost regular rectangle which stretched from ocean to ocean, and bought Alaska, which added 700,000 square miles to our territory.

In 1898 we became an oversea power and started a moderate effort in imperialism, a thing which more and more we are coming to see should nowhere exist under any form

or jurisdiction, if the aim of the world be peace. For the imperialistic idea and that of permanent peace are wholly inconsistent, and I take for granted it is the latter which is wished. I do not think it desirable, however, nor will it come, unless the world reforms its ways and finds better methods to establish character than any we as yet have in evidence.

For war is allied, and very closely allied, with that great uplifter of character—sacrifice. To find as good a thing as war, we have got to permeate the world with the great religion of the golden rule. Instead of the usual dogmas I would blazon it over the world, in every church, temple, schoolhouse and home.

Even now all religions announce it as a fundamental precept, though none accept it in practice. Until we do so it is better to have the uplift by war than none at all.

All the greater powers during this last generation have been actively expanding imperialistically: Great Britain to the extent of 6,750,000 square miles, i.e., twice the area of the whole United States, Alaska included, and 2,000,000 of which have been added since the present war began; France, 3,500,000; Russia, 2,000,000; Germany, 1,000,000, and ourselves some 125,000.

This is no place to go into the ethical questions involved in individual cases. All were more or less wrong and some were deeply wrong, notably in the cases of Egypt, Morocco and Persia. In regard to the first of these I would advise every one to read *Egypt and its Betrayal*, published in 1909 by E. E. Farman, our consul-general there and judge on the International Court for seventeen years. The Egyptian question can only be understood through this book. I know no other which deals with the subject so well.

Egypt's case is, however, only typical. Now nothing is, in my opinion, more certain than that wars will continue unless all these spheres of influence seized since 1880—that is within the memory of many of you here—are thrown open to equality for all nationals, in trade and exploitation.

A notable step in this direction was taken in 1911, when, in November of that year, a convention was signed by

Germany and France, putting Morocco, which had now become a French protectorate, despite all the fine words of the Algeciras conference of 1906, on an equal basis. Germany's insistence upon this step is to her honor.

All this looks finally to throwing the world wide open; to the destruction of the customhouse, and the removal of all trade barriers. No doubt many will not agree at all with this idea. To such I have only to say you must take your choice: freedom of trade and peace, or protection and war. And to such would I say also, that with the former lies the much talked of efficiency.

Protection and efficiency are absolutely antagonistic terms. You will never have the best clothes, the best dyes, the best quality in anything, under protection. However, as I have just said, we can have our choice: if for war, protection; if for peace, the open door. The latter is the only true way to the removal of the causes of war.

A most notable instance of this was the abrogation of the customs boundaries of our own states by the constitution of 1787. Had these remained there would have been war between the several states almost beyond question. A United States with fiscal boundaries between each state is today an inconceivable thing. We have got to apply the principle to the whole world. As Goethe declared: "Above the nations is humanity."

I simply give the foregoing as the drift of what I understand to be the opinion among thoughtful men. One of the foremost minds in our country, an old Republican, a lifelong student of affairs national and international, said to me when Mr. Hughes came out declaredly for protection: "He does not see the drift of things." I myself believe with the critic.

To turn to other things:

We ourselves have come to the parting of the ways. We have got to face the music of actualities. We can drift no longer.

The first and fundamental thing, if we are to save our country as a distinct nation, is to recognize that we are only in the early stages of forming a nationality.

That we must integrate our many widely distinct elements and not tend to disintegrate them through the passions that have arisen during this war. The latter can only mean our ruin. We have the Balkans as an example to avoid.

We are in no sense a nationality as is Germany or England. I say England advisedly, for I now speak not of the British Isles, which are still four widely differing nationalities and still speaking four different languages: the Irish, Gaelic, Welsh and English; for there are many yet in Ireland, Scotland and Wales who do not speak English, or if speaking it, use their native language among themselves.

I know, of personal knowledge, that many Welsh can speak nothing but Welsh, and I have Irish servants whose household language at home was Irish, and they still, though long in this country, use it colloquially. If the United Kingdom, beginning as England and Wales, and adding Scotland and Ireland, have found such difficulty in effecting a complete nationalization, what shall be ours with over fifty nationalities within our borders?

India, with three times our population, on an area but half of ours (omitting Alaska), is the nearest example of similarity. It struggles, too, with a like great difficulty in the way of caste, for, say what we will, we have constituted a pariah caste among us, strongly akin to that of India.

And, too, this caste feeling is strengthening even in the region where it was least expected—New England. I had personal experience of this, as I had a negro motorman this last summer, an excellent and most respectable man. There were places in Vermont and Massachusetts where he had great difficulty in finding any place that would take him in. At Wellesley, in Massachusetts, he had to take a train to a neighboring town to find any accommodation whatever.

This tenth of our population under such conditions is a question the seriousness of which cannot be exaggerated. And we are adding to such difficulties by the free admission of blacks from the Cape Verde Islands, who have almost displaced the whites on Cape Cod, are in their thousands in the cotton mills of New Bedford, and are rapidly extending themselves beyond that region.

It is but the forerunner of a great black migration, unless Africa be put in the category with China and Japan.

The great question involved is: Shall we add to the enormous difficulties from our many varied elements already existing by adding Africa? I am now stating disagreeable facts, but facts are not to be ignored by hiding our heads in the sands of evasion.

In what we came to think as ordinary years of immigration we received in one year as many Russians and Italians as would make another Boston. In 1914 there were 278,152 from Austria-Hungary, 283,738 from Italy, 255,660 from Russia.

These were but the major immigrations. At the same time came scores of thousands from Ireland, Great Britain, Germany, Sweden and Norway, and fives and tens of thousands from Greece, the Netherlands, Denmark, Turkey and other lands.

Quoting from an address I made at Peekskill, N. Y., the last Fourth of July, I said:

There can be no question that these come to us as to a promised land with highest hopes and in many cases with highest aspiration. For men do not leave their native soil, breaking away from family and racial traditions for nothing. They can do so only when they have a certain spirituality of motive, however sordid it may appear superficially.

I can call myself an American as much as can anyone who has not a red skin, as the first of my name landed here 287 years ago, and I can trace no blood in me which is not American for 200 years. Personally I am a compound of British blood, i.e., Scotch, English and Welsh, but despite the facts that, through my ancestors, I have been so long in the country I can not under our system reckon myself more American than the man who has just taken out his naturalization.

And this feeling, I am sure in my own mind at least, we must have if we are to have a real American nation.

We cannot here be British or Italian, French or German or Swede and at the same time be Americans.

For to be an American can only mean one who works for the building of an American nationality. We no more want the separate life here of the many nations which contribute to our stock than we wanted a separate North and South, or want an East and West America.

Our only safety as a nation lies in working toward a complete integration. There is only one alternative: the establishment

of a multitude of Macedonias. One way lies peace and high endeavor and great accomplishment; the other way, war, hate and destruction. These words are not too strong; they are true; in my opinion, profoundly true. I have no objection to the Briton or Turk or Frenchman or German sympathizing with the land of his origin in this great contest going on abroad. I, for one, can appreciate the feeling they are all undergoing. They all have my sympathy.

Even at the time of the Declaration of Independence we were a people of many and varied sorts. There were the English of New England, Virginia and Maryland; the English and Dutch of New York; the English and Germans of Pennsylvania; the Swedes of Delaware; the French Huguenots of New York and South Carolina. When I use the word English it is to include the Scotch and the Welsh, of whom many had come to America.

The Scotch-Irish of Ulster came to the number of 3,000 to 6,000 annually between 1725 and 1768. A famine in Ireland in 1740 caused an emigration, chiefly from North of Ireland, for some years of about 12,000 a year. From 1771 to 1773 some 30,000 came.

It is estimated that half of the Presbyterians of Ulster came to this country in a moderate number of years before the Revolution. The greatest number by far of these we distributed toward the South; few comparatively went to New York or New England, though enough went to New York to give the name of Ulster to a New York county. Many went to Virginia and the Carolinas, and it was these people who formed the bulk of 'The Great Crossing,' as it was called, which traversed the Alleghenies into Kentucky and Tennessee and finally peopled, mainly, the Southwest.

It was a great and adventurous race to which the United States is indebted today for the Northwest Territory, then so-called, which, at the time of the peace, carried our boundaries to the Great Lakes and the Mississippi.

Great numbers of Germans came early in the eighteenth century. This migration began in 1683 and was due chiefly to the seizure of Alsace-Lorraine by Louis XIV, an act which had far-reaching consequences for us in furnishing America one of its best stocks. Seventy thousand Germans entered at the port of Philadelphia between 1727 and 1775. Franklin estimated that at the latter date there were 100,000 Germans in Pennsylvania, a migration that set its mark, lasting to this day, upon the language, customs and religion of the state. "Pennsylvania Dutch" is still a living language.

The real Dutch, the Hollanders, the original settlers of New York, were and remained strong in that state, both through numbers and character. The amazing strength in the latter respect is shown in the persistence of their language to a late date, though the English had taken possession of the colony in 1664 when, it may be well to say, England and Holland were other-

wise at peace. Dutch was still in very common use at the time of the Revolution and it was so for generations later outside of the city of New York.

I have been told on excellent authority that so late as 1840 it was necessary to know Dutch to carry on business on the upper Hudson. And when my wife and I visited her many Dutch relatives in Albany and Troy some thirty years ago, some of the old ladies were rather put out that she could not speak Dutch. One even went so far as to keep a Dutch butler in order to keep up her knowledge of the language.

Few recall that the Swedes were the earliest colonists on the Delaware or know that the oldest church now in use in the eastern part of our country is one built of good solid stone by the Swedes in 1687 at what is now Wilmington and which is still in continuous use.

By 1820 migration began anew, and we have today by careful computation, besides those of British descent, not less than 20,000,000 of German blood, over 12,000,000 Irish, and in these latter days many millions of others of many kinds. There were by the census of 1910 some 32,000,000 of people living in the United States who were either born abroad or born here in the first generation of foreign parentage, or with a foreign father or a foreign mother.

This is a startling fact, one to be taken account of. The Germans come first with 8,250,000 the British, counting Canadians (but not the French), 5,000,000; the Irish 4,500,000, the Scandinavians 3,275,000, the Russians and Finns the same, the Austro-Hungarians also 2,270,000, the Italians 2,000,000. There are over 1,000,000 Jews in the one city of New York, as many as there are Episcopalians in the whole United States. Now the shape in which this vast mass is to be molded is for us to say.

The real problem, says Prof. Edward Steiner in his very interesting book, *The Trail of the Immigrant*, is whether the American is virile enough to assimilate the foreign immigrations and not so much whether the foreign material is of the proper quality.

I agree with him. I find in the newly arrived foreigner a greater sense of responsibility, a greater willingness to work, a greater appreciation of what America should be. I have borne in mind for many years a Russian Jew who came on several occasions to my house in Washington in the early 90's to do some glazing.

Both my wife and myself found him a most interesting and intelligent man, so much so that he usually remained at our request some time for a conversation. His mental equipment was of an unusually high order. There are many of his type. "But," to quote again from my address mentioned:

Whether some of us may like it or not, the indisputable, relentless and compelling fact is that these many and diverse millions are here to stay and become a part of our social and political life. The descendants of a more ancient immigration cannot kill off these many millions nor deport nor intern them. They are an integral part of our makeup.

The only true statesmanship is to make the best of existing things, to recognize that, following our motto, *E Pluribus Unum*, we are to look to the making of one nation out of many, a new people to be welded together through human sympathy and love instead of being divided by hate. It is this, or nothing.

In the state in which I now live, Rhode Island, 69 per cent are either foreign born or of foreign and mixed foreign and native parentage. This means that the old order has passed, that the dominant factor, mentally, morally and physically, is to be what we call the foreigner.

This must be so unless the native stock shows a pre-eminent superiority in these qualities. Of this I see no sign; and I can say this of our whole country. Have we as good municipal administration as may be found in Europe, as good roads, as wise and efficient administration? I think we must say No. The immigrant comes into a system which in such matters is on a decidedly lower plane than in the better parts of Europe.

I can illustrate the effect of this upon a servant woman who some three years since we brought with us from Germany. Landing at Boston, and having a couple of hours before we could leave for our home in Newport, I thought I would give her a chance to see something of this, one of our finest cities. She saw some of the best parts, and, starting to return to the station, she made her first remark: "Schlechte strassen" (bad streets).

Now here was the first impression of an intelligent foreign young woman, and she was right. No German Dorf would tolerate such streets as we passed over that day in Boston, and we were in its best district.

There is no need to dwell upon our failure in such matters. We know it all too well. But the real question is, Are we going to do better? And why should we do so ill at all? Why should we fall behind in these great details

of civilization; why are we incapable of good city design for example? With the best designed city in the world, Washington, for a pattern, laid out by a Frenchman who never received his reward, we have in no instance applied his principles, but have gone to the unintelligent system of rectangular streets, which finds its acme of inconvenience and absurdity in the great city of New York, the most ill-designed in the Christian world.

Nor can we get away from the wooden house, the up-keep of which is so expensive, which is so difficult to heat in winter, and which brings upon us a fire tax of some \$600-000,000 a year, when we count the fire losses, the insurance premiums and the cost of our extravagant fire departments that in New York City cost nine and a quarter millions; in Chicago three and a third; in Boston well-nigh one and three-quarter millions. The country in 1915 paid for its fire departments in its cities of 30,000 and more population, \$57,754,284.

There is nothing more indicative of our ineffective systems of life, for in Europe the fire loss per head of population is but a fifteenth of ours.

Is this "making good?" No. And we all know that we are not making good. The great and grave question is, "Why do we not?" For until our democracy shall produce the highest accomplishment it fails of the purpose of its organization. For democracy is but a type of government. It must stand in the forefront in intellect, in literature, art, national, state and city administration, in good roads and general well-being, or it fails.

Is our failure through simple ignorance—the half knowledge which comes of a superficial education of the millions?

Some years ago Mr. James Lowell spoke of our people as the most public-schooled and least educated in the world. The press, which does little to help, vigorously attacked such a statement. But I must confess that having had large opportunities to form a judgment through a profession which takes one to almost every land, nothing so strikes me as the gigantic ignorance of the world outside of us which overspreads our land.

This comes largely, so far as I can judge things, from a failure to read that great educator, history; and from a press entangled by special interests which cause much both of falsification and suppression of the truth.

Several times I urged Mr. Carnegie to so endow a great daily newspaper of the highest class, to be published in all the great centers simultaneously, to be as good in form as the best, to have illustrations and sell at one cent, and so managed as to be beyond cavil.

Such a paper might be made one of the greatest of educators. It would reach all, while the library reaches but the very few. A tenth of the \$335,000,000 which I know from excellent authority he has given away, devoted to such a purpose, would have made one of the greatest gifts of knowledge ever made to the world.

Referring again to our immigration: Had these many elements not come into our life American population had been today but a small proportion of what it now is.

In 1800 the number of children to 1000 women between the ages of sixteen and forty-four was 976; in 1910 only 508. The proportion of children under five years of age is only seven-tenths what it was even in 1850. If the rate continues, there will be, by the year 2000 but 200 children under five to every 1000 women; by 2060, but 28; by 2070, none.

The families of a number of college graduates, which were made subjects of inquiry, showed in 1815 an average of 5.6 children. By 1875 the number had decreased to 2.5. Of 634 marriages of Harvard graduates of the classes of 1872 to 1877 the average was but 2 surviving children.

There are now, among the native stock of New England but three births to replace four deaths. In other words, our more ancient stock, at least in New England, is dying out. In any case, the great fact that the country faces is that as the foreign-born woman has twice as many children as the native-born, and that as her children reared in America have a decreasing number, more and more is it clear that in time the older stock will be almost entirely displaced by the newer. It is a tragedy far greater than that now

enacting in Europe. The losses of this war can bear no comparison with those in this country of ours through failure of a normal development of life. For potential life is just as important and precious as actual life. You cannot draw the line. Instead of expending all our emotions upon the deaths of war we should keep some for this mighty shortcoming which threatens the older American with extinction.

Had we kept up our birth rate of the early part of the last century we could have peopled these states with more than as many inhabitants as we have now had there not been a single immigrant from 1815 on, and we should have had a close approach to a real American nation.

In saying this I do not mean that this great immigration has been a misfortune. To think so would be to take a very narrow view of things and would be, too, to arrogate to oneself a wisdom superior to an over-ruling Providence, in which I am a firm believer.

I have a detestation of what the French call a Chauvinistic spirit. I do not think that genius and ability are special attributes of my race or of any race. The two great religions which are the guides of half the population of the world had their origin, the one in Palestine, the other in Arabia. In fact, every real religion came from Asia; none from the so-called Christian nations.

The great prime movers, the steam engine, the electric motor, the gas engine came to us from abroad, as did the telegraph, the railroad, the Roentgen ray, photography and, what is most remarkable, every step in steel development. The telephone was invented by a Scot who was twenty-five years old when he became an immigrant to our country.

Strange as it may seem to you, we do not shine as inventors of the larger things. We are ingenious and strong in adaptation rather than inventive in the large sense.

One can enumerate, of course, many fine American inventions, particularly in farm implements, of which the cotton gin is perhaps the most notable through its amazing increase of cotton production which in turn brought the great calamity of fixing slavery upon us until the Civil

War came to free us, leaving however a social condition almost as serious. If you examine the subject with an open mind, I think you will find my general statement correct. Protection and a low view of commercialism have worked our ruin. We cannot turn from these lower views, even to take our place on the seas; we prefer to gamble in stocks rather than turn to matters of real statesmanship and progress.

There must, of course, have been a reason for this sort of backwardness in the larger things of invention. Partially it is to be found no doubt in the fact of our newness in the great period of invention, which was rather the earlier part of the nineteenth century than the later. And then, too, Europe had the development in mentality which came from the great struggles of the Napoleonic period.

For say what we may, every great war is followed by a great uplift in mental power of one kind or another. It is a mighty stimulus. And this is one of the things we shall have to meet. Europe for nearly two generations has been undergoing the education which comes from discipline. This of itself is an immense energizer.

During the seven years I lived in England as naval attaché to our legation (now an embassy) I was on intimate terms with a most interesting and able old man of my own name Sir Edwin Chadwick, born in 1800. He was of a most inquiring turn of mind, had been the father of many reforms and was one of Jeremy Bentham's executors, though then a very young man.

He came out in a pamphlet against German militarism, attacking it as an economic waste. I took issue with him, and between us we pursued an inquiry into the subject. We were greatly aided in this by the late Empress Frederick, who was a friend of my old friend.

Among the answers we received was one from an Englishman who employed several thousand men on a contract for new drainage works at Potsdam. He stated that he paid the men who had been through the army an average of 30 per cent more than he paid those who had not been.

Now here is unquestionably one of the great German

secrets of efficiency—discipline. And if they acquired that efficiency in peace what degree of efficiency will have developed by the end of this war? And not the German only but the Frenchman and Englishman, not to speak of others.

The whole of Europe is in reality developing by leaps and bounds an efficiency with which our own can by the very laws governing such things, bear no comparison.

Europe for one thing, and it is unquestionably a mighty factor in success, is learning a wonderful economy in living, and a knowledge how to sustain a wholesome life on little. Is there any sign of this among us? Are our women learning in any greater degree how to cook, or do they care at all whether by buying in neatly prepared packages they are paying double or treble what they should?

We have in maize one of the best and cheapest foods in the world. It has largely gone out of use through the ignorance of the newcomer, and like everything else it comes to one, when it comes at all, in a small package at double the price it should.

We have, in fact, become the most wildly extravagant nation in the world, as, for instance, paying, in some cases, 32 cents a pound for carefully put-up polished rice, which is the mother of neuritis, and which should not be allowed to be sold at all, while the farm price per bushel has in the last ten years not exceeded 91 cents and the price in New York and Cincinnati varied from 3 to 8 cents a pound.

I sometimes think that my friend Mr. Brooks Adams is right in saying that he is convinced that the difficulty with the United States is a complete intellectual bankruptcy.

But be that as it may, there can be no question that we are going to meet the European world, at the end of this war, strung to the highest pitch of efficiency. It will start on the new life with a vigor, a keenness and an ability greater than the world has ever yet seen, the outcome of the mighty education of war.

The central powers particularly have been undergoing two forms of efficiency which, apart from any other development, will carry them far. The one is in household economy, the other is in intensification of their agriculture.

Where shall we be in such a rivalry? What shall we do to meet it?

To speak frankly, I am staggered at the prospect, for we were behind in this great game when the war began and where shall we be at the end of it?

Will our public schools help us? No. They have through generations been softening our fiber by bringing up our young men under women. This is not to say that the woman is not a good instructor, for she is frequently better than the man; but that is not, or should not be, the main object of schools. Instruction in mere book learning is easy; that in character quite another thing, and it is the latter which is the preëminent object of education.

The woman teacher unquestionably passes over in a large degree her psychic qualities to the boy; she feminizes him. What we want is a masculine character in the boy; a feminine in the girl. We get the latter; we fail in the first.

I can illustrate this by a remark before a small body of gentlemen called together to hear him of a clergyman interested in a school which took in and brought up orphan boys. He said:

We are often called on to take boys too young to profit by our course. We get round this occasionally by trading for an older boy at St. Mary's, which takes care of both boys and girls, but there is no place from which we so dislike to receive a boy. He comes to us with a coating of femininity from which he never recovers.

Our first real step, therefore, is to put the boy under a man, no matter what the cost. I say no matter, because the question is vital to the country. We should stick at no cost.

I should like to go into this question at length and say something of the over-emotional character our ways of life have developed, but there are reasons besides want of time. All that I shall say is that we have got to produce less emotionalism, such as has run riot during this war, and we have got to understand that there is something more important than a game of football.

We can only pull out of the slough, in which we unquestionably are, through an entire reconstruction of our public school system, and perhaps a general military service of modified degree.

The first must develop a more virile character and a sterner system, which shall teach that higher sense of personal responsibility which seems to be so fast disappearing; which shall produce a seriousness which will make us look with shame upon failure in quality, whether it be in manners, streets, city and national administration, or standards in manufacture or government. The second will give us a much needed sense of discipline.

Our very roads, surfaced as a rule with but six inches of broken stone and with no foundation, stare us in the face as evidence of a superficiality from which we must emerge if we are to be in any sense world leaders in the strenuous period which is coming upon us.

It is for you men of position and thought to take our country in hand and shake into it something higher than the aspirations of a football team; to shame us out of our gigantic wastefulness in everything which concerns life, whether of food, timber, iron—more precious than gold (of which, according to one of our geologists, we have of higher grades not over twenty-five years' supply in our country)—and wasteful ways of agriculture. How wasteful is shown by a comparison for which I have to turn to Germany.

Some of you may not like these frequent references to Germany efficiency, but I would quote to such as have such enmity the Latin dictum *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*. For Germany raised in 1912 on 5,558,000 farms averaging less than fifteen acres each 40 per cent more of wheat, rye, barley, oats and potatoes than we on 6,340,000 farms averaging each 138 acres.

In this fact lies the secret of Germany's immense staying power which has been the wonder of the world during the past two years. Great Britain has recognized this to the full and has organized on German lines; and it is to this we also must come if we are to hold our own in administrative methods, manufacture, agriculture and above all in

seriousness of character. If Great Britain is not above learning from an enemy with which she is at war, certainly we who are not at war, at least at this writing, can learn of one to which we owe a fourth of our people.

Whether we shall have to come to what we call universal military service, is, to my mind, a question. There is, in fact, no such thing in peace time as universal service. Taking Germany as typical (though all Europe was in the same category), she had 1 man in service for 89 of her population. On the same basis, we would have about 1,000,000 instead of 752,928 in Germany in 1913 (exclusive of some 30,000 commissioned officers of the line).

France had under arms in 1913, exclusive of commissioned officers, 1 to every 69 of her population; Italy 1 to 124; Russia, the great number of 1,384,000, or 1 to 121 of her 167,000,000 of her population.

Every year there arrive at the age of eighteen about 1,000,000 young men in our country. I would have them automatically on arrival at this age enter the army for one year's service. Such a number of enlisted men would require a permanent force of 45,000 officers and 150,000 non-commissioned officers. I would let but few escape on account of defective physique, for a benefit to such is a part of what we are after. It is a somewhat remarkable fact that 80 per cent of those who fought in the Union army in our Civil War were only twenty-one years old and under, and of these more than half were but eighteen and under. Wars are really fought by boys.

An army of 1,000,000 one-year service men would, in many ways, be a great gain to the country. It would take no one too long from the ordinary activities of life; we should look on it as a school much as we do the university, and would be an excellent preparation for the latter. It would give us in a few years several millions of trained men for war, should such unhappily occur, and it would be a most important element in the discipline now so much needed.

How important this is from even a money point of view I have already stated.

If there were more than one year's service the taking care of such an army in peace would be difficult. It would, with no enemy in sight or in prospect, be difficult to prevent demoralization and stagnation. In Europe they were looking across one another's borders, strung to high tension by the psychics of the situation. Conditions demanded a readiness which every man of the more educated countries, at least, felt to the depth of mind and soul.

I believe a one year's general liability to service would be our best solution of this problem.

The navy is a much easier matter to deal with. One of 150,000 men will meet our needs, and this number at least should be available by enlistment.

Until the world shall have arrived at a condition of permanent peace, I would have afloat the most powerful navy in the world.

It is our only real defense against foreign attack. I am no believer in a second-class navy. With a first-class navy, and it is in my view a *sine qua non*, the question of armies becomes a minor consideration. For if we are powerful enough on the sea, we shall be immune from foreign attack; if not powerful enough, we must submit to blockaded ports and invasion, however great the forces ashore. Ships are our only real security.

A final word as to the world outlook.

I think this war is going to end the imperialistic idea, the exploiting of special spheres of influence for the benefit of particular nations. Unless we go thus far at least, opening such regions to equality of trade and exploitation, we shall in the near future but line up for another struggle.

The world must be thrown open in large degree at least. All waterways must be made equally free to all; trading ships must go freely wherever the water will carry them.

There must therefore be no restrictions upon such waters as the Persian gulf, the Red sea, the Dardanelles and such like, any more than there are upon the Categat and Chesapeake bay. Were the Dardanelles absolutely free to commerce, Russia would not need to possess Constantinople.

Such things as I here suggest I regard as but a first step,

one toward the complete freedom which I am sure will come at no distant day; when American goods will move over every foreign railway subject to no more restrictions than the goods of the country to which the railway belongs.

We have got to demand absolute fairness and equality of treatment; until these are established there will be war.

The first thing which faces every man and woman in life is the necessity of gaining a living; food to eat, clothes to wear, and shelter from weather.

These necessities are so fundamental, so certainly the exercise of natural right that any interference, any blocking of the ways to such livelihood, must necessarily be resented.

This is what war is; the outcome of such resentment, the fear of deprivation of such right, and in its most ignoble phase, the greed represented by the exploitations of the spheres of influence to which I am always harking back.

I do not think the happy time I am holding up is coming any too quickly, though, as I mentioned in the earlier part of this paper, Germany's compact with France in November 1911, regarding Morocco, is a happy augury.

I think if a conference of the neutral powers were assembled today it would favor as a basis of peace the opening up of all special spheres of special influence established since 1880 (the date of the beginning of this later development): Egypt, Morocco, Madagascar, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, the Congo State, German Africa, British Equatorial Africa, etc., great regions amounting in the whole to twice the area of the United States. Certainly Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Spain, Brazil, the Argentine and Chile would favor such an arrangement, and I am assured by a distinguished Belgian that so also would Belgium.

The acceptance of such a principle would be the beginning of the end of war. Until we shall come to such an accommodation there will be a new lining up of the world forces for war.

The inquiry is in every one's mind: "How will the war end?"

Whatever my own opinion, I am not going to make a categorical answer to this. I shall endeavor to put a few facts before you and let you form your own judgment. The facts are statistical, and you can thus assure yourself as to their accuracy.

Thus, if we take the populations of the chief warring countries at the beginning of the war and allow to each the percentage of military age (22.3 per cent of the whole) as shown in our own census of 1910, and use for these the percentage which Great Britain has used in a late parliamentary return respecting availables for military service in Ireland, which, taking the whole number of military age, reckons 44 per cent as indispensable for agricultural and other labor, and 40 per cent of the remainder as physically unfit, we have the following, which I give in tabulation:

COUNTRY	POPULATION IN 1914	NOS. OF MILI- TARY AGE ON AMERICAN BASIS OF 18 TO 44 (22.3 PER CENT OF WHOLE POPU- LATION)	NUMBER NECESSARY FOR AGRICUL- TURE AND OTHER LABORS (44 PER CENT OF POPULA- TION OF MILI- TARY AGE BY BRITISH ESTIMATE)	PHYSICALLY UNFIT (40 PER CENT OF RE- MAINDER. BRITISH ESTI- MATE)	REMAINING FIT FOR MILITARY DUTY
United Kingdom..	45,702,960	10,191,779	4,484,381	2,282,959	3,424,439
Canada.....	10,000,000 (round nos.)	2,230,000	981,200	499,520	749,280
Australia.....					
New Zealand...					
France.....	38,530,844	8,592,307	3,780,615	1,924,677	2,886,915
Russia.....	176,233,388	39,300,045	17,292,020	8,804,810	13,207,215
Italy.....	35,081,451	7,823,164	3,442,192	1,752,389	2,528,583
Possible army total of entente powers.....					22,796,432
Excluding Servia, Roumania, Japan and colored races in 1914...					21,797,012
Germany.....	67,086,585	14,960,308	6,582,535	3,351,109	5,026,664
Austria-Hungary	52,550,463	11,618,752	5,112,251	2,602,600	3,903,901
Turkey and Bul- garia.....	25,000,000 (a near estimate)	5,575,000	2,453,000	1,188,960	1,783,440
Possible army total of central powers in 1914.....					10,714,005

We have here the fairest estimate I am able to make of the numbers available for military duty. On its face it is against the central powers about as 2 to 1, if efficiency and

ability to get and keep these numbers in active service be disregarded.

It is impossible to get at the actuality, though I do not for a moment suppose these huge numbers are in the field. There is for instance no conscription in Ireland nor in the British colonies. Thus there were by parliamentary return, up to October 15, 1916, but 130,241 enlistments in Ireland, and, counting out as is done in the parliamentary paper mentioned the necessary laborers, unfits, etc., 161,239 would remain still available for conscription.

I feel obliged to refrain from giving the very moderate number, comparatively speaking, in the field, from a particular power, mentioned to me by an unimpeachable authority.

If the whole availables of the western powers were in active service there would be of British, British Colonials and French, 7,070,634; of Germans and Austro-Hungarians, 9,129,246. They are thus in relative strength as 71 to 91. The latter, however, have that greatest of strategic advantages, the interior line.

Every year (using our own census as a basis) there come to eighteen years of age about 10 per cent of the population. This would give, to make good losses, to Great Britain, 450,000; France, 385,000; Russia, 1,760,000; Italy, 350,000; Germany, 670,000; Austria-Hungary, 525,000; Bulgaria and Turkey, 250,000. There is thus clearly no want of ability to keep up numbers on either side.

In Great Britain, in ordinary times, there is an excess of births over deaths of about 450,000; in France but 30,000; in Russia, 1,725,000; in Italy, 411,000; in Germany, 850,000; in Austria-Hungary, 547,000. Thus, while the others are practically holding their own in population, the Frenchman killed has no replacer. For while the net rate of increase of births over deaths in the United Kingdom is 10.1 per thousand, that of Germany 11.3, of Austria 10.8, that of France is but 1.5; the average of the last three years is in fact less than one.

It is clear that the great sufferer by this war must, in the long run, be France.

I have placed these figures before you with every endeavor at fairness and accuracy, because they are what we should know and what every one can verify by a little personal trouble. Considering them and the situation, the continuance of the war seems to me to mean only more killing with no real victory in sight. As a newspaper put it a few days since: They might as well make peace without victory as make war without victory.

It would seem the part of wisdom to heed President Wilson's suggestions.